

13775

சிவமயம்

**AN OUTLINE**  
**OF**  
**SHIVAGNANABODHAM**  
WITH A REJOINDER TO A CHRISTIAN CRITIC

S. Shivapadasundaram, B.A.

உ.  
சிவமயம்

**AN OUTLINE**  
of  
**SHIVAGNANABODHAM**  
WITH A REJOINDER TO A CHRISTIAN CRITIC

**S. Shivapadasundaram, B.A.**

*Thunthup*

*1982*

*Karthigai Makam.*

**SRI LA SRI ARUMUGA NAVALAR**  
**SABAI PUBLICATIONS**

1. நாவலர் மாநாட்டு மலர்
2. நாவலர் 150ஆவது ஜயந்தி மலர்
3. நாவலர் நூற்றாண்டு மலர்
4. கந்தபுராண வசனம்
5. An Outline of Shivagnanabodham

**AN OUTLINE**  
**OF**  
**SHIVAGNANABODHAM**  
**WITH A REJOINDER TO A CHRISTIAN CRITIC**

**BY**  
**S. SHIVAPADASUNDARAM, B.A.**  
*Retired Principal, Victoria College,*  
**Author of Saiva School of Hinduism**  
**Shaiva Bodham Series etc.**

*Copyright Reserved*

**Price Rs. 10/-**

---

Printed by Arasan Printers, Colombo 2

## PREFATORY NOTE

This is a reprint of a booklet by the Late S. Shivapadhasundaram, one of the most outstanding Saiva Siddhanta Scholars of this country, in which he expounded very succinctly in English the twelve 'Sutras' of Sivagnana Bodham of Meikanda Thevar for the benefit of the seekers of the Truth, who do not understand the Tamil Language. His refutation of some of the mis-interpretations of Sivagnana Bodham as well as his removal of some of the misconceptions in regard to Saiva Siddhantam are of immense value. As the original booklet has been out of print for many years and copies of it cannot easily be procured at present, the Sri la Sri Arumuga Navalar Sabai decided to get it reprinted.

It would perhaps, not be out of place to mention that the Sabai was founded to perpetuate the memory of Sri la Sri Arumuga Navalar, the great Saiva revivalist of the last century, whose dynamic leadership saved the Saiva religion from being smothered out of existence in this country by Christian Missionaries.

The Sabai is deeply indebted to Mr. V. Thirunavukarasu, the philanthropic proprietor of Arasan Printers, for his generosity in undertaking this reprint and supplying the copies free of charge to the Sabai.

V. Siva Supramaniam  
*President*

Colombo  
6th December 1982

*Sri la Sri Arumuga Navalar Sabai*

# CONTENTS

					PAGE
Preface	...	...	...	...	I
Introduction	...	...	...	...	1
Sutram I	...	...	...	...	5
„ II	...	...	...	...	11
„ III	...	...	...	...	22
„ IV	...	...	...	...	24
„ V	...	...	...	...	25
„ VI	...	...	...	...	26
„ VII	...	...	...	...	27
„ VIII	...	...	...	...	31
„ IX	...	...	...	...	32
„ X	...	...	...	...	36
„ XI	...	...	...	...	37
„ XII	...	...	...	...	38

## PREFACE

This little book viz. "An Outline of Shivagnana Bodham with a Rejoinder to a Christian Critic", which furnishes an outline of Sivagnana Bodham of Saint Meikandar, is an addition to the few works in English on Saiva Siddhanta philosophy and serves the purpose of refuting some of the fallacious arguments put forward by Miss Violet Paranjoti M.A., Ph.D. in her book on Saiva Siddhanta. Philosophy is a product of mature reflective master minds and cannot contain fallacious reasonings and conclusions. Oriental philosophies were studied in the West, and were translated into Western languages in the way the translators had understood them. It cannot be said that all their translations carried the spirit in which they were generally understood by the Easterners. Our young students, in these days of renaissance, commence research work in these philosophies and depend upon the translations brought out by the Western scholars, instead of depending on the original texts and commentaries. The intent of the research has always been to probe into the matter available and to cull out new information compatible with the prevailing notions in the field. This is sacrificed in a few research thesistic compositions.

A few years ago, it pained me not a little when I read the Christian lady's book on Saiva Siddhanta, as it appeared to be a collection of misconceived facts. The young author deserves all encouragements and congratulations for her earnest endeavour to produce such a book. But it has to be regretted that she has not been properly guided on the subject. She hastens to raise objections without pausing for a moment to see whether she had understood unmistakably what she had read. It must clearly be borne in mind by those who make an attempt to understand the philosophical systems of the East, especially the Saiva Siddhanta, that saints and sages in their infinite mercy have tried to unravel to the inquiring mind truths that they had received and experienced in their God-conscious state, and that the homely illustrations introduced by them should be properly interpreted without pressing the analogies to a fantastic extent. Further it is a great pity that the original works and commentaries are woefully neglected and the so-called scholars, whom the universities often honour with Degrees of Doctorates, are blissfully ignorant of the original works on the subjects taken up for research. As one attached to the Holy Order



of a Saiva mutt in South India, I feel that Siddhanta is no ordinary subject, which by mere reading one can easily master. Many intricacies here and there need elucidation at better hands. Even at this ripe age of mine, constant reflection and discussion do not unearth the mysteries of God and His Shastras. Such a hard and tough subject demands great and divine minds to associate and confer together in this sacred cause. When I was anxiously hoping for a day to contact eminent men interested and advanced in this knowledge, the Madras University prescribed this book for consultation for the study of Saiva Siddhanta. My agony was all the more heightened as I felt that the university had erred in prescribing the book, by which the spread of correct knowledge of Siddhanta would be very much impaired. It, therefore, became my sacred duty to seek a good exponent of Shaivism who can correct all misconceptions contained in the said book.

By the Grace of God, my sincere friend, Sri Shivapadasundaram of Jaffna, consented, at my request, to review Miss Paranjoti's work, and has written this little book, clearing the misconceptions by logical arguments supported by a good number of homely illustrations. How Chit can operate on Achit, and vice versa, how the changes in the evolutes of Maya are only relational and not essential, how Maya illumines the soul and is the opposite of Anava are among the subjects fully explained. His rich experience as the author of several works on Saiva Siddhanta has been brought to bear in this treatise, making the answers to the critic most convincing. May his good labour dispel all misconceptions on this subject. May Lord Shiva bestow His choicest blessings on him.

SOMASUNDARA THAMBIRAN  
of Dharmapuram Adhinam.

Vaidyeshvarankoil,  
Tanjore District,  
Vikriti year, Thirukartikai.

உ.  
சிவமயம்

## AN OUTLINE OF SHIVAGNANABODHAM WITH A REJOINDER TO A CHRISTIAN CRITIC

### INTRODUCTION

The Shaiva Siddhanta is the philosophy expounded in the Vedas and in the Shivagamas, which its followers regard as Divine Revelations. Its main characteristic is the positing of three distinct entities (Tri-padarthas), God, soul and matter, and its basic virtue is love for all living beings. The following Vedic texts, among others, give expression to these truths:—

“Both God and soul are eternal, they are alike in possessing consciousness. They are closely associated,—God pervading the soul. The Prakriti, which is likened to a tree, whose branches are the multiform universe, which is resolved into its elementary condition at the time of dissolution, is also eternal. The natures of these three are also eternal. Of the two, God and Soul, the latter alone reaps the fruits of this tree of universe, good or evil; while the former does not. He is the All-Glorious Being, who shines within, without, and all around. God, the Soul, and the Prakriti, all these are distinct from one another.” (Rig. Veda I-165-20).

“O God, may you give me your grace to enable me to love all other living beings and to make them love me”.\* (Yajur XXXVI—18).

\*The Veda thus teaches love for all living beings, and our saints practise it so fully that they pick flowers from the ground for their puja, and would not pluck them from the plants, as that would hurt them (Siddhiar IX-II). On the other hand, Buddhism does not prohibit meat-eating, which is the cause of the killing of millions of animals and fishes every day. Buddha himself is said to have asked for and eaten boar's flesh. (Buddha-Dhamma p. 71). Yet, an Indian philosopher says that we borrowed kindness to living beings from Buddhism. This is like saying that the sun borrowed its light from the glow-worm. Tiruvalluvar says, “How can a man be kind to other living beings, who eats the flesh of other living beings in order to increase the flesh of his own body?”



"They prosper who abstain from meat and cleanse and eat other foods". (Rig I-162-12).

"May you give greatness to the householder who never kills any living being." (Rig VII-1-1).

The Gnanapada of all Shivagamas gives a full account of Shaiva Siddhanta. Some of these give, in addition, the essence of the whole philosophy, in the form of Sutrams. Shivagnanabodham belongs to this class. It consists of twelve Sutrams and forms the twelfth chapter of the Papa Vimochana Padalam, which is the seventy-third Padalam of the Rourava Agama. Shivagnana Yogi says that this is not only the essence of the Gnanapadam of Agamas but also a clear statement of the philosophy. As another instance of the Agamas including the essence in the form of sutrams, he mentions the first slokam of Mrigendra Agama.

It is very much to be regretted that the custodians of the Shivagamas have allowed most of them to perish, probably as food for white ants. The commentators of Shivagnana Siddhiar and the brilliant commentator of Muktinishchayam have referred to over twenty out of the twenty-eight Moola Agamas.\* The latter work was written only three hundred years ago, and contains over twenty quotations from the Rourava Agama. It is anyhow some satisfaction to us that we have the Shivagnana Bodham which is an integral part of a Shiva Agama.

Shivagnanabodham is further hallowed by its use by a long line of spiritual teachers. It is said that, from Anantesar to Paranjyoti Muniver, all the spiritual teachers were using Shivagnanabodham. Five hundred years before Paranjyoti Muniver taught this to Meikandar, the great Paramacharyar under the Kuruntha tree at Tiruperunturai was seen with the same book in his sacred hands.

We owe it to Paranjyoti Muniver and Meikandar that we have a Tamil translation of this sacred book. The Muniver, in his

\*All the twenty-eight Agamas seem to have been in existence in 500 A.C. "In the Kailasanatha temple of Kanchipuram we have an inscriptional record of the twenty-eight Shiva Agamas, in which the Pallava King, Rajasimhavarman, states his faith, and it is said to belong to the end of the 5th Century A.C."

infinite mercy to the Thamil land, commanded his disciple to translate it into Thamil and add to it a paraphrase. Meikandar asked his disciple Arulnandhi Shivam to elaborate Shivagnanabodham. Arulnandhi Shivam had made a complete study of all the Shivagamas and was hence known as Sakala-Agama-Punditar. He took the Shivagnanabodham as the text of his new work and drew freely from the Agamas all the matter that was necessary to supplement it and make it comprehensive, and named it Shivagnana Siddhiar. Two of the commentators on Siddhiar, Maraignana Desikar and Shivagra Yogi frequently mention the Agamas from which the subject matter of Siddhiar was taken. The former mentions under each important stanza of Siddhiar the Agamas on which it is based. The latter quotes\* profusely from them. Arulnandhi Shivam's disciple's disciple, Umapati Shivam, wrote Shivaprakasam and seven other works.

Shivagra Yogi wrote a Sanskrit commentary, consisting of twelve thousand slokas on the twelve sutrams of the original Sanskrit work. Sivagnana Muniver wrote an equally extensive commentary on the Tamil work. It is called Dravida Mahabhashyam in order to distinguish it from the Sanskrit Mahabhashyam of Shivagra Yogi. He wrote also a concise commentary on it.

He divided the twelve sutrams into four sections of three sutrams each, and gave them the names, pramana iyal, lakshana iyal, sadhana iyal and payan iyal. These respectively speak of the existence of the Tripadarthas, their natures, the means of attaining moksha, and the nature of moksha. His Mahabhashyam is a vast store-house of Shaiva lore.

Shaiva philosophy postulates truths of three levels. Those at the lowest level are knowable by experience, that is, through the senses. To the second level belong truths which ordinarily transcend the senses but are knowable by the intellect. There are also truths which transcend the intellect, and which can be known only from Divine revelations, called Agamas. Since these truths transcend the intellect, they cannot be questioned, they have only to be

\* Those who are ignorant of the fact that Siddhiar is based on the Agamas fancy that it was a product of Arulnandhi-shivam's intellect and regard the Shaiva Siddhanta expounded in this work as "the choicest product of the Dravidian intellect" The reader will see that this is a gross superstition.



accepted. The intellect cannot grasp the nature of God or of souls. We have, therefore, to accept unquestioningly what the Agama says about these.

Modern science is only two thousand years old, and its history is a history of blunders. What was considered as infallible truth yesterday is regarded today as false. Science has yet millions of years before it, and those we regard today as the highest scientific truths may before long be laughed at as silly superstitions. It would therefore be abject folly to try to examine philosophical truths in the light of modern science. Not only Shaiva philosophy, but several other philosophies too, hold that there are super-intellectual truths, which can be obtained only from revelations and are therefore matters of faith. It is unfortunate that revelations differ, and followers of different religions can only agree to differ.

## THE FIRST SUTRAM

அவன் அவள் அது எனும் அவை முனிவரையின்  
தோற்றிய திதியே; ஒடுங்கி மலத்து உளதாம்;  
அந்தம் ஆதி; என்மஞர் புலவர்.

"Since the universe consists of things of various forms denoted by He, She, and It, and since it is subject to the three operations of production, maintenance and dissolution, it is an existing thing that has been caused. That which caused it must be something different from it. This is called God. He causes the evolution of the universe in order to free the souls from *malam*. He causes also the dissolution of the universe."

1. The pronoun "It" denotes the sub-human species and the inanimate universe. Thus, the three pronouns denote the universe of living beings, and the material universe. Both the universes have been undergoing evolution. The organic universe which started with the *protoplasm* has been undergoing vast changes and has culminated *at present* in man. That which has been causing this vast change must be something outside the organic universe. Similarly, the material universe is undergoing change. This earth which at one time was a part of the sun has been separated from it and has become habitable. The whole material universe is in motion from the biggest star to the minute electron. The cause of this incessant change in the universe cannot be in the universe. It must be different from it and is called God. The sutram thus infers the existence of God from the changes to which the universe is subject.

2. Meikandar's disciple discusses the hypothesis that "changing is a quality of the universe itself". He says that when a thing changes, it loses its identity. For example, if water changes into steam, it is no longer water; so changing cannot be a quality of a thing. If it is not a quality of a thing, the cause of the changes must be outside the thing.

3. When the sutram speaks of the changes undergone by the universe consisting of he, she and it, the reference is to the bodies and not to the souls. Souls do not undergo production, maintenance and dissolution. They are eternal.



Meikandar now proceeds to explain the three propositions contained in the sutram.

4. The first proposition says that the universe undergoes the three processes of production, maintenance and dissolution. It is true that we see its preservation. But we do not see its production or dissolution. What right have we to assume these two processes? The answer is that neither its production nor its dissolution can be seen by us. But they can be inferred. All existing things have had a beginning. Things that existed have come to an end. *Existence is thus invariably associated with production and dissolution.* We have therefore a right to say that the existing universe also is subject to production and dissolution.

5. Just as a certain species of plants sprout forth as a whole at a certain season\* and die as a whole at another season\* so the universe is produced as a whole when all the souls are simultaneously fit to take births and is dissolved as a whole when they require rest simultaneously.

6. Meikandar gets his data from observation which all classes of philosophers will readily accept. But his pupil Arulnandhishivam takes his data from reasoning also. He proves the production and dissolution of the universe in the following manner. Every composite thing disappears when it is resolved into its components (as water disappears when it is resolved into hydrogen and oxygen). Since the universe is a composite thing it will have to undergo dissolution when it is resolved into its elements. Composite things come into being when their respective components come together (as water comes into being when hydrogen and oxygen combine chemically). So, the universe, being a composite thing, must have had a beginning when the components came together (see Siddhiar 1-13). He finally establishes the theory that the universe is a product of Maya, which is not a composite thing.

7. The malam referred to in this sutram is Anavam. It is to free the souls from Anavam that the universe is made to evolve. The soul has the ability to know everything, but its ability is made unusable by Anava, with the result that it is regarded as anu, as

\* Arulnandhi Shivam calls these the wet season and the dry season respectively.

exceedingly small. The process of evolution gives the soul the power to counteract gradually and steadily the influence of Anava, and ultimately to vanquish it. Whatever victory it gains over Anava, however slight it may be, it never loses.

Since no two souls appear to have the same amount of ability to know, it follows that the force with which Anava keeps down the soul's ability to know varies from soul to soul. This variation is so very great that souls can be classified into three large groups. Those in which its forces is least are called Vignanakalas, and those in which it is greatest are called Sakalas, and the middle class is called Pralayakalas. We are Sakalas, and we are armed with all the products of Maya to fight Anava. As the Vignanakalas have to meet only a feeble resistance, they have little to do and their armament also is negligible, that is, their Karma and Maya are insignificant. It is therefore usual to say that they have only Anava. For a similar reason, the Pralayakalas are said to have only Anava and Karma.

I will now proceed to examine a Christian author's criticism of portions of this sutram, found in her book, Saiva Siddhanta.

I. In para 4 of this sutram, we find the statement, "Existence is thus invariably associated with production and dissolution". A European translator of Shivagnanabodham correctly translates the passage that, "Beside maintenance, production and dissolution also are seen".\* The passage means, "If a thing† exists, it must have a beginning and an end." But, the Christian critic takes this to mean, "The world, however, has origin and therefore it is real" (page 66), and concludes that the reality of the world is inferred from the assumption that the world has origin. What Meikandar says is just the reverse. He assumes that the world is real and infers that it has origin.

II. In para 5, we saw that the evolution and the involution of the universe *as a whole* was compared to the sprouting forth and the withering away of a species of plants *as a whole* at certain

\* Gordon Matthew's translation p. 8.

† The word "thing" denotes here only observable objects.



seasons. The critic says that this is a fallacy of composition. This is really a comparison, which is as different from the fallacy of composition\* as a horse is from a goose.

III. In another place also, a comparison is regarded by this critic as a fallacy of composition. It is usual to compare the evolved universe to a pot and God to a potter. With reference to this, the critic says, "He (the Siddhantin) argues for the creation of the world by God on the analogy of the pot by the potter. To say that as particular things have their respective authors, so the world as a whole should have its maker is to commit the fallacy of composition" (p. 70). The critic calls this an analogy and yet wants to make out that this is a fallacy of composition.

IV. The critic further says, "as the potter, though well-versed in the art of pot-making, does not know all about the pot, such as for instance, who will buy it, or for what purpose it will be used, and as he is not omnipotent either, and hence unable to control the pot in every way, and hence cannot be considered omniscient or omnipotent." (p. 70).

The critic must first of all know that the analogy of the potter is introduced only to show that a product must have a maker. The analogy need not extend to other points. If a woman's eye is compared to a fish (kayal) for its shape, it would not follow that her eye came from an egg like a fish or feeds on fish like it. Secondly, God did not make the universe for barter. So the question does not arise of knowing the buyer or the use made of it by the buyer. Again, the potter has full control of the pot as long as it is with him. Similarly, God can have full control of the universe at all times, as he has no buyer. So, the analogy, if extended, goes only to show, not that His knowledge and power are limited, but that He is omniscient and omnipotent.

V. The critic proceeds to show that the relation between God, soul and body leads to an infinity of relations. The infinity of relations is based on an absurd proposition formulated by the critic, viz: "The relations are either attributes of the terms to be related or they are independent." (p. 71). But, relations are neither attributes of the terms nor independent of them. For example, 5 is greater than 2. Being greater is the relation of 5 to 2. But it

\* The following is an example of the fallacy of composition:—

3 and 2 are odd and even,  
3 and 2 are 5,  
∴ 5 is odd and even.

is not the attribute whether of 5 or of 2. For 5 is not greater than 6. Again, a relation must subsist between two things. So, it cannot be independent of them. Since the proposition on which the infinity of relation is based is absurd, the infinity of relations also is absurd.

VI. The critic then asks the question "If God exists, who created Him?" (p. 74). The answer is, "It is only a thing which has components that requires a creator. It cannot be said that God is a thing which has components. Therefore, God cannot be created. The Siddhanti holds that not only God but souls, Maya and Anava also were never created."

VII. Coming to the evolution of the universe, this critic says, "If... God operates on this, then arises the problem of how spirit can act on matter" (p. 75).

The critic makes the unwarranted assumptions that spirit cannot act on matter, that chit cannot act on achit, that achit cannot act on chit and so on, and introduces it at every turn. The following are the critic's other questions based on this assumption:—

- (a) How can Anava act on the soul?
- (b) How can Shiva Shakti act on Anava?
- (c) How can Shiva Shakti act on the universe?
- (d) How can the soul act on the body?

These assumptions are utterly groundless. We know too well that the soul acts on the body and uses it as a tool, though the soul is chit and the body is achit. We also know that though the physical body and mental body are both achit, bodily pain and mental pain act on the soul and are experienced by it. It, therefore, follows that chit can act on achit and *vice versa*. Hence Shakti, which is chit, can act on the soul.

VIII. The critic, while praising the monotheism of Siddhanta, wants to make out that the Vedas speak of several gods (p. 80). The critic does not seem to realise that the Siddhanta regards the Vedas as authoritative as the Agamas. In the very first mandalam of the Rig Veda (164-64) is the following mantra:—"The wise call God by such different names as Indra, Mitra, Varuna, Agni, Divya, Suparna and Garutman. But, there is only one God". There are several other passages in this Veda and in other Vedas which uphold monotheism (Rig. X-48-5, Yajur IX-8, XL-1). That the Veda



speaks of only one God is stated by Meikandar in his commentary on the second sutram in the following words, "The Lord is one" says the Rig".

St. Appar gives the substance of the Vedic text very tersely and beautifully in the line, "ஒருவர் தாம் பல பேருளர் காண்மிலே" \*

The Christian critic is probably mistaking the gods (Devas) for God. The Devas are souls which experience the fruits of right action only and are in no way superior to the souls which have a human or even a sub-human body. It is possible that a deva is born even as a worm when its term of enjoying pleasure is over. These gods are as different from God as the spirits (wine etc.) are different from the Holy Spirit. St. Manickavachakar says, "Vishnu and Brahma are regretting the time they waste in heaven and their not being born in this world." \*

It is a matter for regret that our Indian philosopher, who ought to know better also speaks of polytheism in the Vedas.

#### முதற் சூத்திரப் பதவுரை

அவன் அவன் அது எனும் அவை = ஆண் என்றும் பெண் என்றும் இவையிரண்டும் அல்லாதவை யென்றும் அறியப்படுகிற பிரபஞ்சமானது, மூவினமையில் = உண்டாதல், நிலைத்தல். அழிதல் என்னும் மூன்று செயல்களை உடையதாய் விகாரப்படலால், தோற்றிய = ஒருவனுலாக்கப்பட்ட காரியமாய், திதியே = உண்மையான பொருளாம்; ஒருங்கி = இது முன்னொரு காலத்திலே அவனாலே அழிக்கப்பட்டதாய், மலத்து = ஆன்மாக்களுடைய மலத்தை நீக்குதற்குத் துணையாதற்கு, உளதாம் = பின்பு அவனால் ஆக்கப்பட்டதாம். அந்தம் ஆதி = பிரபஞ்சத்தை அழிப்பவனே எமது தலைவனாகிய கடவுளாம்.

\*Tiruchemponpalli Pathigam.

\* "புலனியிற் போய்ப் பிறவாமையில் நாள் நாம் போக்கு கின்றோம் அவமே.....திருமாலாம் அவன் விருப்பெய்தவும் அவரவன் ஆசைப்படவும்....."

—Tiru-palli-Eluchchi 10

PRAMANA IYAL-II

#### THE SECOND SUTRAM

அவையே தானே ஆய்நிலை விளையித்  
போக்கு வரவு புரிய ஆதனமின்  
நீக்க மின்றி நிற்குமன்றே.

1. This Sutram explains the creation of the universe by God, referred to in the first Sutram. It speaks of His Shakti, which fashions the universe, of Maya, which is the material cause of the universe, of Karma, by the experience of which Malam is weakened, and of Malam, which has to be removed.

2. 'God is one with the souls; He is different from them.

(a) As Shakti, which is not different from Him, He makes the souls perform Karma and passes them through the cycle of births and deaths, so that they may experience the fruits of Karma, and thereby the hold of Anava may be weakened.

(b) In His aspect as the one who performs Panchakritya (Creation, Sustenance, Dissolution, Suppression of Anava and Liberation),\* He is called Pati.

(c) In His aspect of being unrelated to the universe, He is called Shiva.\*

3. "God is said to be one with the souls because the souls are in inseparable union with Him. This union is called Advaitam in the Veda." The word Advaitam itself implies two things and only denies their being separate. If the Soul and God were one there would have been no need to use the negative term, Advaitam, which means "not two".

4. "If the Veda speaks of God as Ekam (one), it means there is only one God".

5. "Karma is an action and is thus incapable of giving a return to the soul which performs it. Just as the land gives the

\*The Tamil names for these are படைத்தல், காத்தல், அழித்தல், மறைத்தல், அருளல்.



suitable return to the cultivator for his toil, so God gives the suitable return to the soul for its Karma, at a time and in a manner, which will do the soul the highest good. The toil does not itself give him the return."

Karma is only action. It is, therefore, non-intelligent and can have no knowledge of the return due to the soul for performing it, especially to the soul's advantage. Neither is it capable of doing any thing long after it is performed.

The purpose of the return given by God in respect of a Karma is the reduction of Anavic limitation and making the soul's power of knowing more and more available to it.

6. (i) The body that the soul gets appropriate to its Karma comes from Maya. Maya has two forms, called Shuddha Maya and Ashuddha Maya. The former evolves into five tatvas, namely, Nadam, Vindu, Sadakyam, Ishvaram, and Shuddhavidya. These are sometimes called Shiva tatvas. Ashuddha Maya evolves into seven tatvas, namely, Kala, Niyati, Kalai, Vidya, Ragam, Purusha and Prakriti. These seven tatvas are sometimes called Vidya tatvas. From Prakriti evolve Guna, Buddhi, Ahankara, Manas and the five organs of senses, the five organs of action, the five tanmatras and the five bhutas. Thus from Prakriti evolve twenty-four tatvas, ordinarily called Atmatatvas. To sum up, there are five Shiva tatvas, seven Vidya tatvas and twenty-four Atma tatvas. But, our Indian philosopher says that there are thirty-two Atma tatvas and four Vidya tatvas!

(ii) Of these tatvas, the five bhutas form the gross body. The senses (Gnanendriya) and the tatvas of action (Karmendriya) form the external tools of the soul. Manas, Buddhi and Ahankaram\* are the internal tools (Antah Karana) of desiring, knowing and doing. The tanmatras and the antahkaranas form the subtle body.

It must be remembered that what are called the senses are not the eyes, the ears etc. in the gross body. The senses are those which translate the energy conveyed to the sensorium into the original forms. For example, when I look at a cow, the light from the cow enters my eyes and, reaching the retina, is changed into

\*Some authors regard Guna as the tool of action.

some form of energy which is conveyed to the sensorium by the optic nerve. That energy is translated into the form of a cow by the sense of sight.

(iii) The tatvas form not only the bodies of souls but also the worlds they live in and the objects they enjoy. The worlds are called bhuvanam and the objects of enjoyment are called bhogam. The body is called tanu and the tools of knowledge etc. are called karanam. Thus the tatvas supply the souls with tanu karanam, bhuvanam and bhogam.\*

## Karma

### IX. Right and Wrong.

Shaiva Philosophy does not recognise the existence of evil. Instead of classifying actions into evil actions and good actions, it divides them into wrong actions and right actions. Right action is action which reaches the standard given in the Vedas and Agamas.

The embodied soul has several wants. To satisfy these wants it performs Karma (action). In its early stages, it is unable to adjust itself correctly to the situation, as the influence of Anava on it is very great. It gradually improves its adjustment and finally reaches the correct standard.

If, therefore, a soul is not able to act correctly it is not its fault, it is due to anavic limitation. We cannot therefore call an erring soul a bad soul. We can only say that it is inefficient, the inefficiency being caused by Anava. Neither can we call a wrong act a bad act. Therefore all souls, and hence all men, are good and all their acts are also good.

Secondly it is only by passing through a series of wrong acts that the soul can reach the right act. Therefore wrong acts necessarily precede right acts.

\*"It is the tatvas that form the body (tanu), the inner and outer tools (karana), the worlds (bhuvanam), and the objects of enjoyment (bhoga). They are of use to the soul while in anavic bondage and for freeing itself from the bondage. They do not join God. He who realises these truths is called tatvagnani."

(SIDDHIAR I—78.)



## (ii) *The Law of Karma.*

It is only if wrong doing is followed by pain that a soul will get the tendency to improve. The child which attempts to walk improves by its fall. The beginner in swimming improves by sinking. Similarly, the soul can improve only if a wrong attempt is followed by pain. On the other hand, if a right action is followed by pleasure the soul will get a tendency to stick to it. So the law of Karma is, "Wrong action is followed by pain and right action by pleasure".

## (iii) *The Philosophy of Pain*

The pain that the soul gets as a consequence of wrong doing makes it realise its wrong adjustment and enables it to see better. This ability to see better becomes available to the soul only by the diminution of anavic influence. Thus, the experiencing of pain, as a result of wrong doing, get the soul some liberation from anavic grip. Similarly, the experience of pleasure as a result of right doing creates in it a tendency for further right doing and gives the soul a clearer vision. Thus, both wrong doing and right doing are a means of lessening anavic limitation, the difference being that the former is followed by pain, and the latter by pleasure.

If the suffering or pain which follows wrong doing is a means of reducing the much greater suffering due to anavic limitation, we ought to welcome it, even seek it and be thankful to God for it, just as a man suffering from a carbuncle seeks a surgeon welcoming the sufferings to be undergone by him during the operation, in order to be free from the much greater suffering that would be caused by the carbuncle.

If pain and suffering are things to be welcomed, there can be no reason in this world for sorrow or grief, worry or fear and our life can only be one of hope and joy, serenity and happiness. This is a gift of Shaiva Philosophy to mankind.

## (iv) *Classification of Karma*

(a) Karma is divided, according to its tools into those of thought, word and deed. It is again divided according to the relation of Karma, into Karma to souls and Karma to God.

The following include right karma to souls:—love, including abstinence from injury, killing and meat-eating, sobriety, including abstinence from intoxicating liquors; respect for others' rights,

including abstinence from stealing and bribe taking; purity including abstinence from unlawful sexual love, envy and jealousy; patience, including freedom from anger and hatred; tranquillity including calmness and serenity.

Our karma towards God includes praising and worshipping God and His devotees, besides rendering them service. There are three grades of service to God, namely, Charya, Kriya, and Yoga. In these three stages, worship is done with the help of images. In the Vedic form of worship, the usual image is fire; living beings, such as the horse, are also sometimes regarded as images. Worship offered with the horse as image is called horse-sacrifice. The following is a condensed account of the horse-sacrifice given in Yajur:—

The horse sacrifice and the human sacrifice "celebrated in the manner described by this Veda (the White Yajur Veda) are not really sacrifices of horses and men. In the first mentioned ceremony, six hundred and nine animals of various prescribed kinds, domestic and wild, including birds and reptiles, are made fast, the tame ones to twenty-one posts, and the wild, in the intervals between the pillars, and after certain prayers are recited they are let loose without injury.... This mode of performing the horse-sacrifice.... as emblematic ceremonies, not as real sacrifices, is taught in this Veda and the interpretation is fully confirmed by rituals and by commentators on the Samhita and Brahmanas.... The horse, which is the subject of the whole ceremony is also avowedly an emblem of Viraj, the primæval and unmanifested being". Colebrooke M. E. Volume I pp. 61, 62.

But, this yagna, most probably influenced by Shaktism, degenerated in post-vedic times into a sacrifice in which the horse is slaughtered. Our Indian philosopher, mistaking this for the real vedic yagna speaks disparagingly of Veda.

(b) Karma is also classified according to the time of performance into past Karma and present Karma, the former done in previous births and the latter in this birth. The fruits of a portion of the past Karma are experienced in this birth. This portion is called prarabdha. As soon as prarabdha is exhausted the soul leaves the body and the body dies. The remaining portion of past Karma is called Sanchita whose fruits are usually experienced in subsequent births.



Karma performed in this birth is called agamya and is classified, according to the time its effects are experienced, into drishtam, drishta-drishtam, and adrishtam. Drishtam is Karma whose fruits are experienced in this birth itself. The fruits of dristadhrishtam are experienced partly in this birth and partly in succeeding births. Adrishtam is Karma whose fruits are experienced in future births.

Thus, karma whose fruits are experienced in this birth consists of prarabdha and of agamya which are drishtam and drishta-drishtam. Of these, the fruit of prarabdha is fixed, but the second and the third are determined by us. If we make up our mind to do right actions as much as we can, a portion of it will give us happiness in this birth, and we can be better off even if prarabdham is not favourable to us. For example, if prarabdham should make my uninsured ship sink, I can make up the loss by hard work and free myself from the suffering due to the loss of the ship. Thiruvalluvar says, "If prarabdham is unable to help you, work hard, and your labour will give you a suitable return". The law of Karma is thus a great incentive for doing the maximum amount of right action.

We shall now come to our Christian critic.

IX. The critic says that the conception of Shakti does not confer changelessness in God (p. 95).

Shakti is one of the three aspects of God and is in no way different from it. It is not a conception different from that of God. It is, therefore, wrong to allege that the conception of Shakti was intended to confer changelessness in God, and then to deny the allegation. There is no such allegation, and it is therefore useless to deny it.

God's changelessness is due to the fact that the universe undergoes evolution and involution in His mere presence. You will find the following lines in the fifth Sutram of this work, "you have forgotten the Vedic text which says that the universe undergoes evolution in Shiva's presence." "Sannidhi Matrena Vidadatya kilam Shiva" is an Agamic text.

X. The critic says, "It is Karma that forms the basis of God's existence." (p. 73).

This is idle fancy, as no Siddhantic work has anywhere suggested this as a proof of the existence of God.

XI. The critic then makes the unwarranted assertion that "God is responsible neither for the existence of Karma nor for its laws". (p. 73).

This Sutram itself says that God as Shakti makes the soul perform Karma and that, according to the law of Karma, He gives the soul bodies and sustains them so that it may experience the fruits of Karma. It is a pity the critic does not study Siddhanta works, and armed with ignorance runs amok on Siddhanta.

XII. The critic then proceeds to make out that "if God is indispensable for the world and souls, these are equally indispensable to Him. It is these that afford Him opportunity to give expression to His creatorship preservation and other activities resulting from His Divine attributes of omnipresence, omniscience and omnipotence." (p. 95).

If these attributes should have no occasion to manifest themselves, it would not follow that God had ceased to be God. He is God because He possesses these qualities; and He possesses them. It is not necessary that they must also be utilised if He is to be God. There are millions of medicinal plants in this world which are not utilised for medicinal purposes. It would be nonsense to say that on that account these plants have ceased to be medicinal plants. Besides, this Sutram gives three aspects of God, one of which is the aspect of being unrelated to the world and the souls, which is called Shiva. God exists as Shiva, without having anything to do with them and without the manifestation of omnipresence, omnipotence or omniscience.

XIII. The critic fathers on Shaiva Philosophy several views which are not held by it, and criticises them. The critic says, "Sakti is also supposed to solve the difficult problem of how God, who is pure spirit, comes into contact with matter" and states "if this had been required to link up God and the world, further elements are required to link up Sakti with God on the one side and the world on the other." (p. 96).

Our philosophy nowhere says that any link is necessary to connect God and the world. This Sutram itself says that God is one with the world (அனையேதானம்). Since He is one with the



world, no linking is necessary. Shakti is, therefore, not a link, and no link would be necessary to link God and Shakti which again are one.

XIV. The critic makes another unwarranted statement that "the Siddhanam in definitely stating that it is Siva's nature to absorb, enjoy and control and that He requires some such thing as suddha maya to meet this need undermines the supremacy of God". (p. 127).

No Siddhantin has ever made this statement, which attributes such wants to God, who is perfect.

XV. The critic asks the sensible question how the changeless eternal Maya can produce the world which is changing.

It is true Maya evolves into various tatvas and causes the world, which is changing. Though several tatvas evolve from Maya, they are identical with Maya and do not essentially differ from one another. For example, *vayu* does not differ from *akasa*, or *manas* from *ahankara* in its essence. They differ only in their functions, which are due to differences in quantity but not in quality. Functions are relational. They are not essential. Relational qualities differ as a result of difference in quantity. Hydrogen and gold differ from each other in a large number of relational qualities—one is a non-metal, a gas, a very light substance, burning in oxygen and so on; the other in a metal, a solid, a very heavy substance, not burning in oxygen and so on. But the two elements are essentially the same, being composed of protons and electrons in the same proportion and differing only in quantity. An atom of hydrogen of a certain type has one proton and one electron, whereas an atom of gold has 197 protons and 197 electrons. Similarly, since functions are purely relational, the tatvas can perform different functions and be essentially not different. Again, when water becomes vapour, it does not undergo any essential difference. What happens is only an increase in the space between the molecules. When a plant grows, it absorbs substance in the air and in the soil. So, when the world undergoes change, the change is only relational and not essential, and such a change is compatible with the eternal nature of maya. The relational difference, which is the result of evolution, is effected by God.

XVI. The critic then proceeds to state the functions of the various tatvas, but observes that whereas the rule is that each

tatva can fulfil only one function, it is broken in the case of Maya, which has the varied functions of serving as cosmic stuff, bearer of Karma a means of deluding souls . . . (p. 129).

The rule applies to the tatvas when they are components of the body. But these same tatvas form worlds and serve as cosmic stuff. (see para 6 iii of this Sutram).

XVII. The critic gives the tatvas the whole credit for the removal of Anavic limitation and makes out that the soul contributes nothing towards it.

The critic must remember that the tatvas are only the tools of the soul. When the soul experiences the fruits of Karma it gains the ability to lift the anavic veil to some extent, which it does with the tool *Kalai*. *Kalai*, *Vidya* and *Raga* far from acting on the shaktis of the soul as asserted by the critic merely help the shaktis in the performance of their functions. It is the soul which initiates all activities and utilises the tatvas for them. *Sivagnana Siddhiar* says of *Kalai* that it slightly lifts the anavic veil so that the *kriya-shakti* of the soul may act more efficiently than before (II-55). When the *kriya shakti* acts, it is really the soul that acts. It is, therefore, wrong to suggest that the soul is passive.

XVIII. The critic misunderstands the part played by Maya when the soul performs karma and ventures to suggest that the soul "finds itself encompassed by a host of objects that seductively invite the soul to become one with them. The tatvas out of which the body is formed support the allurements of the outer things." (p. 130).

Neither the objects outside nor the tatvas that form the body allure the soul. It is *anava* that allures the soul and makes it perform karma. Consider the case of a child with bangles on its wrist standing alone in a lonely place. If a robber sees the child he takes the bangles and leaves the child there. On the other hand if a kind-hearted man sees the child, he will not take the bangles and will not leave the child there. He will take it either to its parents or to some place of safety.

If the objects outside and the tatvas in the body were the forces that make a soul perform karma, the robber and the kind-hearted man would have done the same karma. In both cases the object outside is the same, viz. the child with the bangles. The



tatvas out of which the bodies of the robber and the kind-hearted man were formed were also the same.

But their actions were not the same, because these were not the factors concerned in the performance of a karma. The robber's ichcha shakti was clouded by Maya, from which arose the desire to misappropriate another's property. The kind-hearted man's ichcha shakti was just then free from Anavic limitation and was anxious to help the child. It is, therefore, altogether wrong to suppose that the products of Maya lead to wrong doing. Maya is compared to a lamp given to a person for use during the night (of Anavic limitation). Lamp light is sometimes insufficient for certain purposes, for instance, to distinguish things which are similar. A lamp-carrier sometimes mistakes a snake for a rope and comes to grief. It is this insufficiency of the knowledge due to Maya which is meant by Arulnandhishivam, when he says that Maya is sometimes misleading. The senses, manas and buddhi are products of Maya, which enable a soul to see and to understand. They are, therefore, compared to a lamp.

XIX. The critic's arguments are often of the form "I am hungry because the sky is so high". The conclusion does not follow from the premises. The following is an example. "Since the evil qualities produced by Anava are opposed to the nature of Siva, Anava is reckoned a serious menace to the absolute nature of Siva". (p. 136).

It is first of all absurd to speak of qualities being produced by a thing. Qualities belong to a thing. If the critic means that the evil qualities of Anava are opposed to the nature of Shiva, there is no reason to infer that they affect Him in any way. The colour of chalk is opposed to the colour of a crow. But chalk can have no effect on the crow.

XX. Similar are the arguments used by the critic to show that God's absoluteness is limited by Maya and Karma.

XXI. The critic fancying that by these arguments, the Shaiva Siddhanta has been demolished, proceeds to set up monism in its place as the correct philosophy. The critic says, "The changing world of forms is an appearance of the eternal Absolute.... The eternal Absolute can appear to change.... The individuality of matter is there, transmuted, so that becoming an element of the Absolute, it comes also a harmonious element. The problem of

how Anava can attach itself to the soul that is pure spirit finds solution in the Absolute. Matter and spirit in the Absolute do not stand in opposition to each other... They become elements in a common substrate the Absolute". (p. 138).

Let us examine these statements one by one:—

(a) "The changing world of forms is an appearance of the eternal Absolute".

*Comment:* If there is only the Absolute, there is no one to whom the changing world can appear. It is, therefore, absurd to speak of the appearance of the Absolute. Secondly, the Absolute can have no wants. If the Absolute appears as a changing world, it can have no purpose in doing so and must be mad.

(b) Matter becomes an element of the Absolute.

(c) Anava and Spirit become elements in the Absolute.

*Comment:* The Absolute has thus three elements in it, namely, matter, anava and spirit. Possibly, it has something else also, which we shall call X.

Thus, according to this philosophy, the Absolute is a bundle of four independent entities, Maya, Anava, Spirit and X, and has no existence apart from them. If it has no existence of its own, it is a mockery to call it Absolute. Again, all the objections raised by the critic against the Siddhanti's conception of these entities can be raised against this philosophy also. This philosophy postulates the same entities as Siddhanta, with the difference that the X of this philosophy corresponds to the God of Siddhanta.

### இரண்டாம் சூத்திரப் பதவுரை

அவையே = கடவுள் ஆன்மாக்களே யாயும், தானாய் = அவற்றின் வேறுகியும் நின்று, ஆணையின் இருவினையால் = தமது சத்தியைக் கொண்டு ஆன்மாக்கள் இருவினையாகவும் செய்யப்பண்ணி, அவ்வினையின் பயனாக, போக்கு வரவு புரிய = இறத்தல் பிறத்தல்களைச் செய்யும் வண்ணம், நீக்கம் இன்றி = அச்சத்தியின் வேறுகாமல், நிற்கும் அன்றே = அநாதியாய் நிற்கும்.



## THE THIRD SUTRAM

உளது இலது என்றலின் எனதுடல் என்றலின்  
ஐம்புலனெடுக்கம் அறிதலின் கண்படில்  
உண்டிலிளையின்மையின் உணர்த்த உணர்தலின்  
மாயா இயந்திர தனுவினுள் ஆன்மா.

This sutram proves the existence of the soul. It formulates a disjunctive proposition and rejects all the alternatives except one. The rejected alternatives are (1) the soul is non-existent, (2) the soul is the body, (3) the soul is pranavayu, (4) the soul is the senses, (5) the soul is the antahkaranas, (6) the soul is the subtle body, (7) the soul is God, (8) the soul is Maya.

1. Those who deny the existence of the soul do a good deal of thinking; (a) they have a conception of the soul, (b) they compare this concept with their concepts of the body the senses etc. (c) they form the judgment that the concept of the soul does not agree with the concept of the other things and therefore the soul is none of these. There is something which performs this systematic thinking. This something is the soul.

2. Because the soul is not seen, and we sometimes identify ourselves with the body as when we say "I am fat", some conclude that the body is the soul. But, I speak of "my body", just as I speak of my house, my book etc. This shows that the body is different from myself as are the house, the book etc. Besides, the body does not contain any intelligent stuff and has, therefore, no power of knowing, not even of sensing. As stated in the previous sutram, when light from a cow passes through the eye and reaches the retina, which is opaque, it can enter the brain not as light but as energy. The body has no means of translating this energy into light so that the cow may be seen.

3. There are those who contend that the senses are the soul, as they see things. But, each sense perceives only one kind of sensation, whereas I perceive all kinds of sensations. Therefore, the I (the soul) cannot be the senses.

It is argued that each sense is a soul, and the consciousness of the various sensations is a co-ordination brought about by their

being in one body. The answer is that the senses are not self-conscious the eye is not conscious that it sees, neither is the ear conscious that it hears. These, therefore cannot be the soul; which is conscious of the senses and of the sensations.

4. The subtle body exists both in the waking state and in the dream state. If the subtle body were the soul, it must have an accurate knowledge of the dream. But, when the dream is over, we often forget it altogether, and sometimes have only a hazy idea of it. Therefore, the subtle body is not the soul.

5. Neither is the prana vayu the soul. In deep sleep, the senses and the activity of the body are suppressed although the prana vayu is present. In the waking state, they function. The prana vayu has therefore, no control over these organs and cannot therefore be the soul. That which controls them is the soul.

6. God cannot be the soul. For the soul gets true knowledge only from a Guru, with the help of the Vedas and Agamas. God does not require a Guru to know anything. He is omniscient. Therefore God is not the soul.

7. Maya cannot be the soul. Just as spectacles assist a defective eye in seeing, so Maya helps the soul bound by Anava in acquiring knowledge.

Therefore, there exists a soul which is intelligent (chit) and is different from all these. It makes use of the products of Maya, evolves from its chit-shakti the abilities to know, to desire and to do, is subject to Anavic limitation, performs karma, experiences its fruits, frees itself from Anava, and finally gets Shivanandam.

## பதவுரை

இலது என்றலின் = ஆன்மா என்றொரு பொருள் இல்லையென்று ஆராய்வுசெய்து எது சொல்லுகின்றதோ அதுவே ஆன்மா ஆதலால், உளது = ஆன்மா உள்ள பொருளேயாம்; எனது உடல் என்றலின் = என்னுடைய உடல் என்று நான் சொல்லுதலினால், உடல் என்னின் வேறுனதாம்; ஆதலால் உடல் ஆன்மா அன்று; ஐம்புலன் = ஐம்புலன்களையும் அறியத்தக்கது எதுவோ அதுவே ஆன்மா, பொறிகள் தம்மை அறியமாட்டா, ஒன்று அறிந்ததை மற்றது அறியமாட்டாது, ஆதலால் அவை ஆன்மா அல்ல; ஒடுக்கம் அறிதலில் = ஐம்பொறிகளும் ஒடுங்கிய நிலையாகிய கருவிலே கண்டது விழிக்கும் போது சில சமயங்களிலே வேறுபட்டு அறியப்



படுதலால், சூக்கும தேகம் ஆன்மா அன்று, ஏனெனில் சூக்கும தேகம் ஆன்மா ஆயின் அது கனவிலும் விழிப்பிலும் ஒரே தன்மையதாய், கனவை விழிப்பிலே உள்ளபடி அறிதல்வேண்டும்; உண்டி = இந்திரியங்களின் முயற்சியானது விழிப்பிலே தடைபடாமலும், வினையின்மையின் = உறக்கத்திலே தடைபட்டுமுள்ளது; பிராணவாயுவானது விழிப்பிலும் உறக்கத்திலும் நிகழ்தலால், அக்கருவி களைத் தொழில் செய்விப்பதும் ஒடுக்குவதும் அதனின் வேரான ஆன்மாவாம்; உணர்த்த உணர்தலின் = நாம் அறிவித்தாலன்றி அறியமாட்டோமாதலால் நாம் கடவுளல்லோம்; மாயாயந்திர தனுவினுள் = உடம்பிலுள்ள தத்துவங்கள் யாவும் சேர்ந்த மாயையானது ஒரு யந்திரம் போலத் தானாக இயங்கமாட்டாதாதலால், மாயையும் ஆன்மா அன்று, அதை இயக்குவதே; ஆன்மா = ஆன்மாவாகும்.

#### LAKSHANA IYAL I

### THE FOURTH SUTRAM

அந்தக் கரண மவற்றினொன் றன்றவை  
சந்தித்த தான்மாச் சகாமலத் துணரா  
தமைச்சர சேம்ப நின்றுஞ்சுவத் தைத்தே.

This sutram gives the nature of the soul.

1. Just as the senses serve the soul by carrying sensations, the antahkaranas serve the soul by deciphering the sensations. Of these, Chittam takes up for consideration those of the sensations which are useful and rejects all the others. Manas considers the sensations presented by Chittam. If the Manas has any doubt regarding the nature of the sensation, Buddhi decides it at the instance of Ahankaram. But these are as much the tools of the soul as the senses. Antahkarana literally means inner tool. The soul has to seek the help of these tools, because its ability to know things directly is prevented by Anava. Ahankaram, Buddhi, Manas, Chittam and Purusha are energised respectively by the five elements of Pranava.

2. The soul has five states of consciousness called Jagram, Swapnam, Sushupti, Turyam, and Turyatitam, which differ in the number of tatvas ready for use in the respective states.

3. Of these, Jargam is wakefulness, in which all the tatvams are in a state of activity. Swapnam is dream state, in which the organs of sense and action are inactive. Sushupti is dream-less sleep, in which the organ of sense and action and the antahkaranas are inactive. Turyam is utter loss of consciousness, in which only Purusha and Prana are active. Turyatitam is the state immediately before death, in which Purusha alone is active.

#### பதவுரை

ஆன்மா = ஆன்மா ஆனது, அந்தக்கரணம் அவற்றின் ஒன்று அன்று = அந்தக்கரணங்களுள் ஒன்றன்று, சகாமலத்து உணராது = ஆணவமலமாகிய பந்தத்தினாலே அறியமாட்டாமையால், அமைச்ச அரசு ஏய்ப்பு = மந்திரிகளோடு சேர்ந்து நிற்கும் அரசனைப் போல, அவைசந்தித்தது = அவைகளோடு சேர்ந்து நின்று = அப்படியே நின்று. ஐஞ்சு அவத்தைத்து = விழிப்பு கரு முதலிய ஐந்து நிலைகளையுடையது.

#### LAKSHANA IYAL II

### THE FIFTH SUTRAM

விளம்பிய உள்ளத்து மெய்வாய் கண்முக  
களந்தறிந் தறியா ஆங்கவை போலத்  
தாந்த முணர்வின் றுமியருள்  
காந்தங் கண்ட பசாசத் தவையே.

This sutram speaks of the relationship of Maya, God and soul. Some commentators regard this as the supplement of the second sutram, just as the fourth sutram is the supplement of the third, and the sixth of the first.

1. The senses cannot see things except in conjunction with the soul. Though they are in association with the soul, they do not know the soul or themselves.

2. Similarly, the soul knows by the help of God, but does not know either itself or God, because it sees only through the senses, and the soul and God are beyond sense-perception.

3. But, though the soul experiences through the senses give, God does not experience the pain or pleasure which the soul gets. This is because the senses work for the benefit of the soul, but the soul does not work for the benefit of God. Besides, He



sees not pain or pleasure which is non-real before Him. When God causes the soul to know, the soul is neither identical with God nor separable from Him, as the light of a star is in the presence of sunlight.

4. The Universe evolves and involves in the mere presence of God. He is unaffected by the evolution of the Universe.

#### பதவுரை

மெய்வாய் கண் மூக்கு = மெய்முதலான ஐந்து பொறிகளும் ஏனைய இந்திரியங்களும், விளம்பிய உள்ளத்து = ஆன்மாவுடைய துணையைக்கொண்டு, அளந்து அறிந்து = அளவிட்டு அறிந்தும், அறியா = தம்மையேனும் ஆன்மாவையேனும் அறியமாட்டா, அவைபோல, தாம் தம் உணர்வின் துமியருள் = ஆன்மாக்களும் தம் உணர்வுக்கு முதலாகிய இறைவனது அருளிஞலே வீண்ப்பயன்களை அறிந்து நுகரும், ஆயினும் தம்மையும் திருவருளையும் அறிய மாட்டா, காந்தம் கண்ட பசாசத்தவையே = காந்தத்தின் சன்னிதி மாத்திரையில் இழுக்கப்படும் இரும்பு போல இறைவனது சன்னிதி மாத்திரையில் அவை நின்று அறியும், ஆதலால் இறைவன் வீகாரியாதலில்லை.

#### LAKSHANA IYAL III

### THE SIXTH SUTRAM

உணருரு அசத்தெளி னுணரா தின்மையின்  
இருதிற் றல்லது சிவசத் தாமென  
இரண்டு வகையி னிசைக்கு மன்னுலகே.

This Sutra attempts to give the attributes of God.

Whatever is knowable by the senses comes and goes; it is not eternal. A thing that is not eternal is called asat. God cannot be known by the senses. Therefore, He is not asat. If a thing is altogether unknowable, as a horn to a hare, it is non-existent. But God is not unknowable. He is known through His Grace. Therefore He is existent. When by His Grace, the soul becomes divine, it sees God but not as a thing distinct from itself. Just as the eye enlightened by the soul does not see the soul, so the soul

enlightened by God cannot see God with the help of its own powers. Even when the soul is in the yoga state, it sees only an image of God and does not see God.

#### பதவுரை

உணருரு எனின் = இறைவன் அனுபவத்தாலேனும் யுத்தியாலேனும் அறியப்படும் தன்மை உடையவனுயின், அசத்து = அழியத்தக்க பொருளாகும், உணராது = எவ்வாற்றினும் அறியப்படா னுயின், இன்மையின் = முயற் கொம்பு போல இல்பொருளாகுமா தலால், சிவம் = சிவமானது, இருதிற் றல்லது = அசத்துமன்று இல் பொருளும்ன்று, சத்தாம் = சத்துப்பொருளாகும், என = இவ்வாறு, உலகு இரண்டுவகையின் இசைக்கும் = மெய்யுணர்வுடைய உயர்ந் தோர் பாச ஞானத்தாலும் பசு ஞானத்தாலும் அறியப்படாமை யால் சிவமென்றும், பதி ஞானத்தால் அறியப்படுதலால் சத்தென் றும் சொல்லுவர்.

#### SADHANA IYAL I

### THE SEVENTH SUTRAM

யாவையுஞ் சூனியஞ் சத்தெதி ராகலிற்  
சத்தே யறியாத சத்தில் தறியா  
திருதிற் றறிவுள திரண்டலா ஆன்மா.

This sutram and the next two sutrams give the means of attaining the goal of freedom from malam and of enjoying Divine Bliss. These three, therefore, form the Sadhana Iyal. As the first step in the attempt of the soul to reach the goal is its conviction that it has the possibility of reaching it, this sutram gives the essential nature of the soul and shows that it can reach the goal.

1. "As the universe becomes zero in the presence of God, He is not concerned with it; as the universe is insentient it cannot know God. The soul being neither sat like God nor asat like the universe, is satasat and can know both."

Zero means that which cannot make its presence felt. As God is omniscient and does not see things individually, the universe is non-existent to Him.

2. "When the soul is in conjunction with God, the soul also does not see the universe."



3. "If it is argued that it would be an imperfection in God if He could not see the universe, the answer is that the universe does come under His omniscience but not as an individual thing as we see it." It cannot make its presence felt by God.

4. The soul in union with the universe, sees the universe; and, in union with God, sees God. At present the soul is in union with the universe and sees it. But the time will come when it is freed from the universe and is able to unite with God. The way it secures union with God is the subject of the following Sutram.

Sivagrayogi, a commentator on Shivagnanabodham and on Siddhiar, says that, in this Sutram, Meikandar uses the word Sat as a synonym of Chit, since, in the original Sanskrit slokam corresponding to this, the words used are Chit and Achit. As the malams are non-intelligent they are Achit; as God is never conditioned by Anava, He is pure Chit; as the soul, though Chit, is conditioned by Anava and knows only when it is made to know, it is called Chitachit.

Strictly speaking, even the malams are eternal, and are therefore Sat, which ordinarily means existing. It is only the universe that is changing and may rightly be called asat. But Sivagrayogi proceeds to justify the malams being called Asat, on the ground that they become powerless when the soul gets released from them. His earlier statement that the word Sat is used as a synonym of Chit appears to be more acceptable.

We shall now come to our Christian critic.

XXII. The critic says that the argument against the subtle body being soul is untenable, because the gross body includes the subtle body also. (p. 142).

This is wrong. The gross body composed of the five bhutas is different from the subtle body and does not include it. When a person dies, it is the gross body which perishes, the subtle body does not perish.\*

XXIII. Again the critic thinks "that the career of the soul merely consists in its changing its outer garb, which in the kevala avastha is of asat, in the sakala avastha of sadasat, and in the suddha avastha of sat". (p. 150).

\* "When the gross body dies, the soul retains the subtle body of eight tatvas". (Siddhiar 11-36)

The seventh sutram says that the essential nature of the soul is sadasat. Sadasat is, therefore, not a garb; neither are sat and asat its garbs. The soul is sadasat whether in the kevala, in the sakala, or in the suddha state. It is not asat in the kevala state or sat in the suddha state. As we have said before God's ability to know is not capable of being limited by anything, whereas the soul's ability to know is capable of being limited. Therefore, God may be called pure Sat, and the soul asat-sat.

XXIV. The critic says, "The essential nature of the soul which the Siddhantin considers to remain consistent is its trait of dependence on Siva". (p. 150).

No sensible Siddhantin would ever make this statement. Dependence on Shiva is a relation and not an attribute. It can therefore never be an essential attribute.

XXV. The critic says further, "The view of soul as an entity having iccha, kriya and gnana saktis does not rise to meeting the requirements of personal identity. . . . When these (tatvas) are absent, the shaktis cease to function". (p. 152).

When the shaktis cease to function they do not disappear. They are there. When a man is asleep, his eyes do not function. But they do not disappear! The man does not become blind.

XXVI. The critic says that the soul in the kevala state is with anava; in the sakala state with anava, Shiva, Arul, Tirodhana; and in the suddha state with God. (p. 153).

This is quite wrong. God and soul are ever inseparable. Even in the kevala state, the soul is not separated from God. Neither are His Arul shakti and Tirodhana shakti separable from Him. The sakala state differs from the others in the soul possessing the tools of Maya.

XXVII. The critic commits a serious blunder in saying, "It is this almost complete transformation of the intelligent soul to non-intelligent matter that constitutes the tragedy of kevala avastha". (p. 157).

There is no authority for this statement. On the other hand, the soul can never be transformed into anything else. It can never become matter. Intelligence is an essential nature of the soul. It cannot therefore become non-intelligent.



XXVIII. The critic further says "Kevala comes to be dreaded because it is the state in which ignorance abounds". (p. 157).

Kevala is not dreaded, but is welcomed, because it is a period of rest. There is no more ignorance in Kevala than in the preceding sakala state. The amount of freedom from anavic limitation of the previous birth continues in the kevala state. In this state, the soul may not be able to read newspapers or writings of Christian critics but is none the worse for it.

XXIX. The critic puts a question, which ought to have been put much earlier, "How can anava which is achit be in union with the soul that is chit?". (p. 174).

The answer is that there is nothing to prevent their being in union. (See answer to criticism VII).

XXX. The next question is, "How can the soul be eternal in spite of the various avasthas experienced by it, and in spite of careering through endless transmigration". (p. 174).

The avasthas depend only on the number of tatvas that are active.\* The soul undergoes no change whatever in passing from one avastha to another. Similarly, in transmigrations, it is the bodies that change and not the soul. These, therefore, do not contradict the fact of its being eternal.

XXXI. Then comes the question, "If these changes do not affect the soul, why does it undergo them?" (p. 174).

The answer is that these avasthas and transmigrations are means to the soul to get out of anavic limitation.

XXXII. The critic then says that the share that is allowed the soul is so very little that the soul is more an instrument in the hands of God than a self-subsisting being". (p. 175).

The answer is that if the soul's share is little, it is still an agent and cannot therefore be regarded as an instrument.

#### பதவுரை

சத்து எதிர்முன் = சத்துப் பொருளாகிய சிவத்துக்கு முன்னே யாவையும் சூனியம் = பிரபஞ்சம் முழுவதும் (சிவத்துக்குத் தோன்ற மையாற்) சூனியமாகும், சத்தே அறியாது = ஆதலால் சத்தாகிய

\* see fourth sutram - para 7.

ரிவம் அசத்தாகிய பிரபஞ்சத்தை அறிதல் செய்யாது, அசத்து இவது = அசத்தாகிய பிரபஞ்சம் அறிவில்லாதது, அறியாது = ஆதலால் அது சிவத்தை அறியாது. இரண்டு அலா ஆன்மா = சத்தாகாமலும் அசத்தாகாமலும் சதசத்தாகிய ஆன்மாவானது, இருதிறன் அறிவுளது = சிவத்தையும் பிரபஞ்சத்தையும் அறியத்தக்கது.

#### SADHANA IYAL II

### THE EIGHTH SUTRAM

ஐம்புல வேடரின் அயர்ந்தனை வளர்ந்தெனத்  
தம்முதல் குருஷமாய்த் தவத்தினி லுணர்ந்தவிட்  
டன்னிய மின்மைபி னரன்கழல் செலுமே.

1. The soul which has been made to realise that it has the ability to know God gives up its intimacy with things of this world and follows the path that leads to Shivagnanam. As a result of its following this path, God becomes its Guru and says to the Soul, "Having been brought up by savages, the five senses, you have forgotten what you really are". Then the soul realises its Advaita Union with God and reaches His feet.

2. The path the soul followed consists of the three steps called Charya, Kriya and Yoga.\* As these three steps are ways of worshipping and serving God, they give not only the Karmic fruit of happiness which is short-lived, but also Shivagnanam, which never perishes. These three are, therefore, called imperishable Tapas, as against Tapas performed for obtaining worldly ends. It must be remembered that these only can lead to Gnanam, which alone can give freedom from Anava.

3. Vignanakalars get Shivagnanam from the Guru by His directly illumining them. To the Pralayakalars, God presents Himself as their Lord and gives them Gnanam. To the Sakalars He gives Shivagnanam through a Shivagnani. As the Anavic grip of the Sakalars is very strong they have to pass through several processes, for which a human being like them is indispensable.

\* Charya is doing service in temples and performing puja to God in a morphous image. Kriya is puja to God in Shivalingam. Yoga is meditation on an amorphous image of God.



4. This process of giving Shivagnanam to the souls is called Deeksha. During the Deeksha, whatever is left of the power of Anava and the effects of Agamy which the soul would perform after obtaining Deeksha would disappear by the presence of the Gnanashakti of God. The Sanchita and the Mayeyam are destroyed by his Kriya Shakti. Whatever is left of the soul's Prarabdha is removed by the experiencing of it.\*

5. On receiving the Deeksha, the soul fully realises that it is different from the senses and reaches the Feet of God, just as, when the swing-rope breaks, the mother earth becomes the support, and just as when a river breaks the dam it flows to the sea never to return.

#### பதவுரை

தம்முதல் = தமக்குப் பரம் பொருளாகிய சிவபெருமான், தவத் தினில் = சிவபுண்ணிய விசேஷத்தினாலே, குருவுமாய் = குரு வடிவம் கொண்டு எழுந்தருளித் தீட்சை செய்து, ஐம்புல வேடரில் = ஐம் பொறிகளாகிய வேடருட்பட்டு, வளர்ந்து = அவர்களோடு வளர்ந்து, அயர்ந்தனை = உன்னுடைய பெருந் தன்மையை மறந்து விட்டாய், என உணர்ந்த = என்று அறிவிக்க, விட்டு = அவ்வேடரை விட்டு நீங்கி, அன்னியம் இன்மையின் = சிவத்துக்கு வேறுகாமல், அரன் கழல் செலுமே = அவருடைய திருவடிகளை அடையும்.

#### SADHANA IYAL III

### THE NINTH SUTRAM

ஊனக்கண் பாசம் உணராய் பதியை

ஞானக் கண்ணிவிற் சிந்தை நாடி

உராதுணைத் தேர்த்தெனப் பாச மொருவத்

தன்னிழ லாம்பதிவிதி பெண்ணு மஞ்செழுத்தே.

This sutram speaks of the purification of the soul through Shivadarsanam.

1. Let the soul discover by Shivagnanam, in its own consciousness, the Lord who cannot be known whether by its own gnanam or by sense knowledge. When the soul gives up the world as a quickly moving mirage, Shivagnanam becomes cool shade. It will meditate on Panchaksharam in the prescribed manner so that Shivadharsanam may never be missed.

\* see siddhiar VIII. 10

2. It may be argued that though the soul cannot see itself by means of sense knowledge (Pasagnanam), it can see itself by means of its own knowledge (Pasugnanam). But just as the eye can see neither itself nor the soul which makes it see, so the soul neither sees itself nor the Lord who enables it to see. Therefore find out God Who hides Himself in you, through His Grace.

3. When the universe is rejected as non-real God will, by Himself, miraculously appear for ever.

4. Then the soul will have to imagine itself to be God so that it may be completely free from malam just as the man who imagines himself to be the garuda is able to remove snake-poison. This imagination of the soul as God is called Shivoambhavanai.

5. In order to maintain this pure state the soul will have to meditate on Panchakshara, seeing God in its consciousness.

6. With the help of Panchaksharam, the soul sees that it belongs to God, worships Him in his heart, offers homam in the navel, meditates on Him between the eyebrows, and becomes His servant.

7. Whereas the seven planets can be perceived by the sense of sight, Rahu and Ketu cannot be seen. Even so, whereas other things can be comprehended by the soul, God transcends the comprehension of the soul. But, just as Rahu and Ketu can be known with the help of the sun and the moon during an eclipse, so if the soul fixes its consciousness above the heart-lotus with the help of Sri Panchaksharam, God will appear and become known.

Rahu and Ketu are the points of intersection of the path of the earth and of the path of the moon. When the earth and the moon are at these points, these and the sun are in the same plane, and it is possible for the earth to hide the sun and for the moon to hide the sun, causing respectively the eclipses of the moon and the sun. The position of Rahu and Ketu are thus seen with the help of the moon and the sun during the time of eclipses.\*

Since the heart-lotus consists of the thirty-six tatvas and God is above the tatvas, He must be contemplated above the heart-lotus.

\* In the geocentric method, the sun is supposed to be in Rahu or Ketu instead of the earth.



### Sri Panchaksharam

The Panchaksharam referred to in this Sutam is the Mukti Panchaksharam, which leads the spiritually minded Soul to Mukti. Manikkavachakar refers to this in Tiruvasaravu (10)<sup>1</sup> and Appar in the Tiruppatiripuliyurpathigam. Its value is explained in Tiruvarulpayan, Ummaivilakkam, Tirumantram and several other works. Panchaksharam literally means five letters. The letters of Mukti Panchaksharam embody Siva, Parashakti, the soul, the Tirodhana shakti and Malam respectively. The soul thus stands between Shiva and Mala, in the hands of Parashakti on one side and Tirodhanam on the other side. The former Shakti does constructive work by leading it Godward. The latter exhausts the energy of Malam by making it work, and gradually releases the soul from it. The mantram also shows the insignificance of the soul compared to God. Whoever meditates on this Mantram tends to recede from Malam and to move towards God. Noting his own insignificance he sees that his body and his other possessions are still more insignificant, and learns to give no importance to them. He is an infinitesimal compared to God, and his possessions and objects of desire are an infinitesimal compared to him. Thus the contemplation of Panchaksharam weakens both I-ness and My-ness, which are the creations of Anava. A closer study of Panchaksharam would give one all ultimate truths. Hence Sambandhar said, "The truth of the Four Vedas is Panchakshara."

The Panchaksharam intended for worldly minded men is the one which begins with Nakaram. This is the one with which Tiruvachakam begins and which is sung in two Pathigams by Sambandhar and in one each by Appar and Sundarar. Sambandhar says of this that it will reform men who are given up to killing and to other wrong ways. <sup>2</sup> It makes worldly minded men spiritually minded.

1. நானேயோ தவஞ் செய்தேன் சிவாயநம எனப்பெற்றேன்  
தேனாயின் னமுதமுமாய்த் தித்திக்குஞ் சிவபெருமான்  
தானேவந் தென துள்ளம் புகுந்தடியேற் கருள் செய்தான்  
உனரு முயிர் வாழ்க்கை யொறுத்தன்றே வெறுத்திடவே.
2. கொல்வாரேனுங் குணம் பல நன்மைகள்,  
இல்லாரேனு மியம்புவராயிடின  
எல்லாத் திங்கையு நீக்குவர் என்பரால்,  
நல்லார் நாம நமச்சிவாயவே.

Tirumantram says and Kodikavi\* speaks of a third form of Panchaksharam consisting of the first three letters of Mukti Panchaksharam, the letters of Tirodhanam and Malam being absent. This seems to be intended for those who have obtained liberation from malam.

We thus see that there are three forms of Panchaksharam, one of which leads from wordliness to unworldliness, another from unworldliness to liberation from Malam and the third from liberation towards one-ness with God.

It is held by some that there are yet two other forms. In one of these the soul is absent, having been merged in Shakti, and there are only two letters. This state of the soul which has attained liberation from Malam is mentioned in the following Tiruvachakam

வான் கெட்டு மாருதம் மாய்ந்தழல் நீர் மண் கெடினும்  
தான் கெட்டலின்றிச் சலிப்பறியாத் தன்மையனுக்  
கூன் கெட்டுயிர் கெட்டுணர்வு கெட்டெனுள்ளமும் போய்

Tiruvavulpayan (IX-9) speaks of a form in which the soul stands between Shiva and Shakti.

நான் கெட்டவா பாடித் தெள்ளேணங் கொட்டாமோ.

The next form of Panchaksharam is supposed to be a single letter (Ekaksharam) in which the Shakti and the Soul have merged in Shiva; several authorities are quoted in support of this.

அங்கமும் ஆகம வேதம தோதினும்,  
எங்கள் பிரானெழுத்தொன்றில் இருப்பது  
சங்கை கெட்டல் வெழுத் தொன்றையுஞ் சாதித்தால்,  
அங்கரை சேர்ந்த அருங்கலமாமோ. — Tirumular.

மாய நட்போரையும் மாயா மலமெனும் மாதரையும்  
விய விட்டோடி வெளியே புறப்பட்டு மெய்யருளாத்  
தாயுடன் சென்று பின் தாதையைக் கூடிப்பின் தாயை மறந்  
தேயுமதே திட்டை என்றான் எழிற் கச்சி ஏகம்பனே.

— Pattanathar.

Some Pandits deny these two forms.

\* அஞ்செழுத்தும் எட்டெழுத்தும் ஆறெழுத்தும் நாலெழுத்தும்  
பிஞ்செழுத்தும் மேலைப் பெருவெழுத்தும்—நெஞ்சமுத்திப்  
பேசும் எழுத்துடனே பேசா எழுத்தினையும்  
கூசாமற் காட்டக் கொடி.



## பதவுரை

ஊனக்கண் பாசம் = குறைவுணர்வாகிய பசு ஞானத்தாலும் பாசஞாவத்தாலும், உணரா பதியை = உணரப்படாத இறைவனை, ஞானக்கண்ணினில் = சிவஞானத்தினாலே, சிந்தை நாடி = தன் அறிவின் கண் ஆராய்ந்தறிக, உரரத்துனைத் தேர்த்தென = உணரப்படாத வேகத்தையுடைய பேய்த்தேரின் இயல்பையுடைய, பாசம் ஒருவ = நிலம் முதல் நாத மீராகிய பாசமானது நீங்க, பதி = அப்பதிஞானமானது, தண்ணிழலாம் = குவிர்ந்த நிழலாய் விளங்கும், ஐஞ்சு எழுத்து விதி எண்ணும் = அந்த இறைவனது காட்சி நீங்காமைக் காக திருவைந்தெழுத்தை விதிப்படி எண்ணும்.

## PAYAN IYAL I

## THE TENTH SUTRAM

அவனே தானே யாகியவந் தெறி  
யேகனாகி யிறை பணி நிற்க  
மல மாயை தன்னொடு வல்வினை யின்றே.

The next three sutrams give an account of the results of the Gnana Deeksha mentioned in the eighth sutram, and of the meditation on Panchaksharam and the Shivo Ham Bhavana mentioned in the ninth sutram. The tenth sutram explains how the soul is freed from the three malams.

The soul now sees that it has become one with God and drops the idea of itself having any separate existence. It is then free from I-ness and My-ness i.e. from Anava, and it rests in the Grace (Feet) of God, one with Him.

Thereafter, every act of the soul becomes God's act, which cannot therefore be a karma. An act becomes karma mala only if it is done when I-ness is present. As the soul has no more I-ness no act of the soul can be karma mala. The soul is thus free from Agamy karma. It is free from the effects of Prarabdha also. For, when Prarabdha affects the body, the effects on it cannot reach the soul, as the soul is detached from the body.

## பதவுரை

அவனே தானே ஆகிய அந்நெறி = பெத்த நிலையிலே இறைவன் ஆன்மாக்களோடு ஒன்றாய் நின்று தான் அவைகளே யாகி நின்ற அந்த விதமாக, ஏகனாகி = ஆன்மாவானது கடவுளோடு ஒன்றாகி நின்று, இறைபணி நிற்க = இறைவனது அருள்வழிப்பட்டு நிற்க, மலம்மாயை தன்னொடு வல்வினையின்றே = ஆணவம் மாயை ஆகிய இவைகளே யல்லாமல் வலியதாகிய கன்மமும் நீங்கிவிடும்.

## PAYAN IYAL II

## THE ELEVENTH SUTRAM

காணுங் கண்ணுக்குக் காட்டுமளம் போற்  
காண வுள்ளத்தைக் கண்டு காட்டலி  
னயரா வன் பிவரன்கழல் செலும்மே

This sutram states that freedom from malam is followed by God's bliss (Shivanandam). Freedom from malam is only a negative state, in which the soul has none of the troubles caused by malam. This is followed by the positive state of Shivanandam.

The soul is chit and has always the power of knowing. So, even in the state of union with God it has the power of knowing, and knows, but, knows only when it is made to know by God. When in union with God, it knows only Him, with His Grace, just as the eye knows with the help of light. In knowing Him, it finds infinite Bliss. Since God is all-knowing. He knows what the soul knows, not as a particular piece of knowledge but as an element in His eternal conscience.

## பதவுரை

காணும் கண்ணுக்கு = தன்னுடைய ஆற்றலையுமாதிரம் கொண்டு காணமாட்டாததாய் உயிரினது உணர்வைத் துணை யாகக் கொண்டு காணுகின்ற கண்ணுக்கு, காட்டும் உளம் போல் = உயிரினது உணர்வென்றும் கண்ணினது உணர்வென்றும் வேற்றுமை யின்றி உடனாய் விரவி நின்று உயிரானது கண்ணுக்குக்காட்டு வின்றது போல, உள்ளத்தைக் காண = உயிரானது தன்னுடைய ஆற்றல் கொண்டுமாதிரம் காணமாட்டாத பரம்பொருளைக் காணுதற்கு, கண்டு காட்டலின் = அப்பரம் பொருளானது தன்னுடைய அறிவை உயிரின் அறிவுக்குத் துணையாகக் கொடுத்து தான் வேறு உயிர் வேறு என்ற வேற்றுமை சிறிதும் இன்றி தான்



காணுதலும் உயிர்காணுதலும் ஒன்றேயாக அதற்குக்காட்டுதலால், அயரா அன்பின் = அந்த ஒன்றைத் தன்மையால் உயிரில் உண்டாகிய உறுதியான எல்லையற்ற அன்பினாலே, அரங்கழல் செலும் = உயிரானது இறைவனது திருவடியாகிய சிவாநந்தத்தை யடையும்.

### PAYAN IYAL III

## THE TWELFTH SUTRAM

செம்மலர் நோன்றார் சேரலொட்டா  
வம்மலங் கழிஇயன்பரொடு மரீஇ  
மாலற நேய மலிந்தவர் வேடமு  
மாலயந் தானு மரனெனத் தொழுமே.

This sutram speaks of Jivan Muktas.

1. Having been liberated from the malams which prevent the soul from reaching the sustaining lotus-like feet of God, the Muktas mix with other Shiva-gnanis and worship as God those devotees and His sacred shrines.

2. Jivan Muktas are souls free from Anava but not from prarabdha. It is only when the prarabdha has done its work that they will be free from their body. They have, therefore, to remain in this world even after they have become free from Anava.

3. Prarabdha tends to act on their Shaktis. But, their Gnana shakti sees God in those whom they join and in temples. Their Ichcha shakti seeks their company, which re-inforces their love of God and is a means of experiencing Divine Bliss. Their Kriya Shakti engages itself in worshipping them and sacred shrines, Prarabdham has therefore no effect on them.

XXXI. We shall now come to our critic, who confuses Karma with the law of Karma and has no correct understanding of either.

First of all, Karma is not beginningless (p. 195) in the sense that maya and anava are beginningless. A karma is a particular action, and every action is limited in Him. A particular karma cannot, therefore be beginningless. But, since karma is performed one after another, it forms a chain. Again as birth is beginningless and karma is performed in each birth, this chain is beginningless. This kind of beginninglessness is called Pravaha anadi. This

chain of karma comes to an end, when the soul is free from Anava and has given up its I-ness. No act can be called Karma which is done without the sense of I-ness. \*

XXXII. The critic says "He (Siddhantin) says that Karma is a Mala or impurity which obscures souls". (p. 195).

This is a false statement. Karma is a means of diminishing the obscurement caused by Anava. By experiencing its fruits, the soul gradually frees itself from Anava. Karma is thus an antidote to obscurement.

XXXIII. The critic then asks how it is possible for the past karma of the soul accumulated till the time of deeksha leave the soul without being experienced by it. (p. 159).

The soul has to experience the fruits of karma solely for the purpose of weakening the grip of Anava. When the soul is released from Anava at deeksha, it is useless to experience the fruits of karma any further. The soul is therefore freed at deeksha from the accumulated karma. The law of Karma is "The fruit of right action is pleasure, and the fruit of wrong action is pain." This law is never broken. The fruit of right action never happens to be pain, neither does the fruit of wrong action ever happen to be pleasure.

XXXIV. Referring to the release from Anava, the critic says that if the Shakti of God overpowers Anava and if at release the Shakti subsides in Shiva, it cannot overpower the Anava of a soul at Mukti. (p. 196).

The answer is that the Shakti subsides in Shiva only at the time of the involution of the Universe, and not when a particular soul obtains release. Besides, at Mukti the soul has become Godly and, Anava can have no power over it in that stage.

An Indian Philosopher also does not seem to have a clear conception of the subtle way in which the Law of Karma works, and condemns, therefore, the idea of hell. In the scheme of the evolution of the soul, heaven and hell become as necessary as rest and birth. Mathematically they are indispensable.

\* See Shivaprakasam II 30.



We know too well that the prarabhda whose fruits are experienced in this birth consists of karma performed in previous births. This means that the fruits of the karma may not be experienced as soon as it is performed and that there must be a definite and simple rule according to which the fruits of karma are experienced. Since the purpose of experiencing karmic effects is the evolution of the soul, it ought to be experienced when it can give the soul the maximum benefit. If the maximum benefit can be obtained immediately after the karma is performed that is the time for its experience. Otherwise the karmic fruit is experienced at some other time. There are thus four mathematical possibilities of the ripeness of a soul's Karma, the soul when leaves a particular body:—

1. It may have a fund of both right karma and wrong karma ready to be experienced.
2. It may have only a bundle of right karma to be experienced.
3. It may have only a bundle of wrong karma to be experienced.
4. It may have no kind of karma ready to be experienced.

When the soul is in the first situation, it takes rebirth. For, in a birth of this kind, pleasure and pain which are the fruits of right karma and wrong karma can be experienced.

In the other situations, the soul cannot take a birth, as it is impossible to live in an ordinary body without a mixture of pain and pleasure. The soul in the second situation has to experience only pleasure. The place or state where it can have this is called heaven (swarga).

The soul in the third situation has to experience only pain, and this is possible only in what is called hell.

In the fourth case, the soul will have to rest till a portion of its Karma is ready for experience.

Meikandar's disciple says that God puts into hell those who perform wrong acts and into heaven those who perform right acts, so that they may be free from these karmas and so that the anavie limitation may be reduced. These are only medical treatments of the Lord Physician to cure the soul.

"He who commits wrong against the injunction contained in the sacred shastras given out graciously by God, will suffer pain in the dark regions of hell; and thus get rid of his sin. The virtuous man works out his karma by eating the fruits in the heavenly regions. This kind of suffering and enjoyment are the two kinds of medicines which the Supreme Physician administers for the removal of man's mala."

XXXV. The critic asks "How the Shakti of Shiva changes from Tirodayi to Arul shakti, so that from concealing the true nature of the world, it reveals the same . . . If it is Chit, it must be made clear how it is enabled to act on Anava, which is Achit." (p. 197).

As regards the first question, Tirodayi never conceals the true nature of the world. What conceals the true nature of the world is Anava. The Tirodayi exhausts the energies of Malas by making them work.\* The second question is an oft repeated question of the critic to which reference has already been made.

XXXVI. The critic then asks, "how can God, who is Absolute assume the form of human being to give deeksha to Sakalars." (p. 198).

The answer is that He does not take the form of a human being, but acts through a human being who is a Shivagnani. (Hence, the deeksha is called Sadhara Deeksha).

XXXVII. The critic takes hold of Umapatishivam's comparison of Advait Mukti to the word Tadalai (தடலை) which is a single word consisting of the words, tal and talai, inseparably united, as God and soul are at Mukti. The critic pursues the simile, states that, at mukti, the soul undergoes change as the first letter of talai becomes the letter 'd' in tadalai, and asks how the soul, a single entity, can be the substrate of change. (p. 214).

The answer is that the simile does not extend to these details and that the soul does not undergo any change at Mukti.

XXXVIII. We shall refer to one more criticism. The critic says "to the extent that God has to reckon with the individuals and to the extent that the working out of his purpose depends on the will of the individual, God is a limited being". (p. 200).

---

\* Siddhiar II - 87.



We have only to remind the critic of the fact that the evolution of the Universe and of the souls takes place in the mere presence of God. He has no reckoning to make or purpose to be worked out. He is therefore not a limited being.

#### பதவுரை

செம்மலர் நோன்தான் சேரல் ஓட்டா = செந்தாமரை மலர் போன்றதும் என்றுங் காப்பதும் ஆகிய இறைவனது திருவடியைச் சேரவிடாது மறைக்கும், அம்மலம் கழிஇ = மும்மலங்களையும் ஞான நீராற் கழுவி, அன்பரொடு மரீஇ = மெய்ஞ்ஞானிகளோடு கலந்து கூடி, மால்அற = மல மயக்கம் தீர, நேயமும் மலிந்தவர் வேடமும் = அன்பு நிறைந்த அன்பருடைய திருவேடத்தையும், ஆலயம் தானும் = சிவாலயத்தையும், அரன் எனத் தொழும் = இறைவனை கவே கண்டு இச்சீவன் முத்தர் வழிபடுவர்.

THE END



